

"social" injunction that these things may not be discussed? Will the woman who sells her body in a loathsome marriage forever be held "respectable" and the woman who gives herself in a pure love and affection forever be outcast? Will people ever free their minds and begin to think? One can but wonder.

In the chapter on Sexual Abstinence there is an enormous amount of food for thought, for any one who will let himself think. "We ought to say, Rohleder believes, 'Permanent abstinence is unnatural and has never existed.' . . . If indeed we were to eliminate what is commonly regarded as the religious and moral aspect of the matter—an aspect, be it remembered, which has no bearing on the essential natural facts of the question—we cannot fail to perceive that these ostentatious differences of conviction would be reduced within very narrow and trifling limits."

Lest Ellis be regarded as "socialistic" (Heaven save the mark!), weigh carefully this excerpt from the same chapter:

"It seems to me that there should be no doubt whatever as to the correct professional attitude of the physician in relation to this question of advice concerning sexual intercourse. The physician is never entitled to advise his patient to adopt sexual intercourse outside marriage nor any method of relief which is commonly regarded as illegitimate. It is said that the physician has nothing to do with considerations of conventional morality. . . . But, after all, even if that be admitted, . . . In giving such a prescription the physician has in fact not the slightest knowledge of what he may be prescribing. He may be giving his patient a venereal disease; he may be giving the anxieties and responsibilities of an illegitimate child; the prescriber is quite in the dark."

And, if you really want something to think hard about, consider this:

"It has been necessary to treat seriously this problem of 'sexual abstinence' because we have behind us the traditions of two thousand years based on certain ideals of sexual law and sexual license, together with the long effort to build up practices more or less conditioned by those ideals. We cannot immediately escape from these traditions even when we question their validity for ourselves. We have not only to recognize their existence, but also to accept the fact that for some time to come they must still to a considerable extent control the thoughts and even in some degree the actions of existing communities.

"It is undoubtedly deplorable. It involves the introduction of an artificiality into a real natural order. Love is real and positive; chastity is real and positive. But sexual abstinence is unreal and negative, in the strict sense perhaps impossible. The underlying feelings of all those who have emphasized its importance is that a physiological process can be good or bad according as it is or is not carried out under certain arbitrary external conditions, which render it licit or illicit. An act of sexual intercourse under the name 'marriage' is beneficial; the very same act, under the name of

'incontinence,' is pernicious. No physiological process, and still less any spiritual process, can bear such restriction. It is as much as to say that a meal becomes good or bad, digestible or indigestible, according as a grace is or is not pronounced before eating it."

For those who wish really to think about the truth and to study human problems rather than to swallow delusional and hysterical personal opinions, this book of Havelock Ellis' will be indeed a treasure. But probably there are many who will be scandalized that anyone should have such "ideas;" verily, they know not truth.

---

#### COUNCIL MEETING, MAY 17th, 1912.

A joint meeting of the Council of the State Society and of the Committee on Public Policy and Legislation was held in San Francisco on May 17th, 1912, at noon. Of the Council there were present Drs. Kenyon, Ewer, Aiken, Edwards, Ryfkogel, Van Zwalenburg, Spencer and Parkinson; of the Committee there were present Drs. Bine, Carpenter and Barbat; there were also present the President, Dr. Hamlin, and the Secretary, Dr. Jones.

An application from the Pacific Wassermann Laboratories for advertising space in the JOURNAL was referred to the Council from the Publication Committee, which had rejected the advertisement. The Council, on motion, referred the matter back to the Publication Committee with the suggestion that the advertisement be accepted if the prices charged are not given in the advertisement and if it is stated that the advertisers are not practicing medicine.

In the matter of the Panama Pacific Exposition, on motion a committee of five was appointed to act with other similar committees and to confer with the directors of the exposition. The committee is to consist of the President, the Chairman of the Council and the Secretary of the Society, together with two additional members to be appointed by the respective presidents each year. The President, Dr. Hamlin, has appointed Dr. H. C. Moffitt and Dr. W. Jarvis Barlow to act on such committee.

The Chairman of the Committee on Public Policy and Legislation, Dr. Bine, brought up the various matters which had been referred to that committee by the House of Delegates, for discussion. They were discussed at considerable length, after which the Committee was, on motion, instructed to take steps to have the amendment to the medical law creating a state tax of two dollars (\$2.00) a year on all practicing physicians as proposed in the resolutions introduced into the House of Delegates by the Los Angeles Association (see minutes in June JOURNAL, page 228), adopted by the next legislature and to have this fund used in the most liberal manner possible for the protection of the public in the enforcement of the law regulating the practice of medicine in the State of California.

The Council then adjourned at the call of the Chairman.